



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

tabulation and renders a real service. (5) The many translations of Latin passages are invariably accurate, as one would expect. That they did not always strike the present reviewer as being felicitous, is only a proof that a former student may some day presumptuously differ from an honored master.

Typographical slips are creditably rare, although *bletat* (p. 102) is rather startling. One must regret the printing of words and phrases from various languages in the same type as English words, the few exceptions in the text only serving to emphasize the confusion.

FRED B. R. HELLEMS

Sophokles. Erklärt von F. W. SCHNEIDEWIN und A. NAUCK. Zwei-tes Bändchen: *König Oedipus*. Elfte Auflage besorgt von EWALD BRUHN. Berlin: Weidmann, 1910. Pp. 239. M. 2. 20.

Sixty years ago Schneidewin first published his school edition of the *Oedipus Tyrannus*. At his death in 1856 the work of revising his *Sophocles* passed into the hands of the great conjectural critic, August Nauck, who issued one edition of the plays after another, the ninth of the *Oedipus Tyrannus* appearing in 1886. Bruhn published the tenth in 1897.

In text and commentary the present edition is an improvement on its predecessor. This manifests itself in some cases, viz., vss. 667, 840, 1182, 1309, 1461, in the rejection of conjectures adopted in the tenth edition, in favor of the reading of the MSS. But in 463 and 806 also the reading of L and other codices should have been kept, as in the previous edition. Bruhn now reads *εἶδε* in 463, but, in support of *εἶπε* and the participle, cf. Soph. *El.* 676, *O.C.* 1580, Plat. *Gorg.* 481c, etc.; and he adopts Robert's conjecture *τῆς τροχλάτου* in 806 in preference to the MS reading *τὸν τροχλάτην*, which occurs in the same story in Eur. *Phoen.* 39.

Vs. 13. Bruhn would omit *οὐ*. This is wrong; cf. Dem. 19, 123, Philem. 213, Herod. 2, 110, Plat. *Lys.* 212d, etc. *μὴ οὐκ ἔχω* in 221 illustrates the same principle, but here the editor without warrant gives to each negative a separate negative force. Vs. 31. *σέ* is governed by *κρίνοντες*, not by *ἐξόμεσθ' ἐφύσσιοι*. Vss. 44 f. Bruhn construes *βουλευμάτων* with *ἐνμφορὰς* in the sense of "advice contributed (*συμφέρειν*) by others." For a better interpretation in which *βουλευμάτων* is made to depend on *ζώσας μάλιστα*, cf. *Classical Philology* II 94 f. Vs. 360. The reading adopted in the text *ἡ πέρα λέγειν* is inferior to *ἡ 'κπειρᾶ λόγων*, which is implied in L and supported by a scholium. Vs. 586. There is nothing "indefinite" about the protasis *εἰ . . . ἕξει* (= *μέλλει ἕξειν*). Vs. 624. Bruhn still maintains that 624 is "a meaningless remnant of a longer debate between Oedipus and Creon." Vss. 656 f. The editor reads *μηδέποτε' αἰτιά σ' ἐν ἀφανεί λόγων*. If emendation is needed—and this is doubtful—Seidler's *μηποτ' ἐν αἰτιά σύ γ' ἀφανεί λόγων* is to be preferred. Vs. 659. Clearness and symmetry demand *φυγῇ* rather than *φυγεῖν*. Vss. 702 f. M. Seyffert's

ἐγκαλεῖν ἔχεις and Bruhn's conjecture τέκμαρ (709), which are adopted in the text, are both unnecessary. Vs. 917. If, as seems likely, the original reading of L was εἰ . . . λέγοι, this should be adopted in preference to ἦν . . . λέγει, since it is amply supported by *Al.* 521, 1159, 1344, *O.C.* 352, *Ant.* 666, 1032, *O.T.* 314, 979, etc. Vs. 1021. ὀνομάζετο is an affectionate middle, "he called me *his own* child." Emendation is not needed. Vs. 1064. The imperative δρᾶ suits Jocasta's excited state of mind (cf. 1056, 1057, 1061) better than the infinitive δρᾶν (so Bruhn), and it is not necessary that 1064 should conform in structure to 1065. Vss. 1462 f. In adopting the fem. dual forms ταῦν 1462, αῖν 1463, 1466, ταύταιν 1504, Bruhn accepts the evidence of the MSS (see Kühner-Blass I 604; II 584) in preference to that of the inscriptions (Meisterhans³ 123). Cf. τοῖν φίλοιν δακρυρροοῦντων 1472. In the Critical Appendix ὕπο στραφεῖς 728, κατῆλθ' 117, and ὄλεθρον 1343 are attributed as conjectures to Ed. Schwartz, but the first comes from the MSS, the others had been made by previous scholars, F. Ascherson and Turnebus, and all are found in one or more texts.

It goes without saying that in spite of criticism this is an excellent edition of the play, improved through a long series of revisions.

CHARLES W. PEPPLER

EMORY COLLEGE

De poetarum Atticorum arte scaenica quaestiones quinque. Scripsit
PAULUS GRAEBER. Göttingen: Dieterich, 1911. Pp. 60. M.
1.50.

The more important conclusions advanced in this dissertation are as follows: "In Aeschylus and twice in Sophocles, when a new character enters the scene, he converses first with the chorus (or *coryphaeus*), even if another actor is already present; especially striking instances are *Persae* 249 and 681. Of course, this practice arose in the one-actor period and lapsed after the addition of a third actor. Incidentally, it has a bearing on the stage question, for it is inconceivable that an actor should regularly ignore another actor on the stage beside him in favor of the chorus in the orchestra below" (chap. i).

The second chapter, "De choro et histrionibus," contains little that is new except the hypothesis that the number of *choreutae* in the early chorus was fifteen, which was reduced to fourteen, thirteen, and twelve as the first, second, and third actors were added by the successive promotion of *coryphaei*. There is no use pointing out that this ignores the traditional derivation of tragedy from a dithyrambic chorus of fifty, for Aristotle and his statements on this subject are utterly *de trop* nowadays and it is popular to trample them under foot; in fact, Graeber is himself a convert to Dieterich's theory that the histrionic element in Greek drama came from Eleusis. But Graeber's hypothesis also runs afoul of comedy; for, since the formal recognition